(*b*) what are the recommendations of the Committee;

(*c*) if the opinion is in favour of starting a factory in Shimoga, when do the Government propose starting one there?

A.—The GENERAL SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. H. V. Ramaswami).—(*a*) No.

(*b*) and (*c*) Do not arise.

Mr. V. V. IYER.—Did not a deputation wait on the Dewan to urge the necessity for establishing a sugar factory at Shimoga?

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—Until the report of the Committee is received, no decision can be taken in the matter.

Mr. V. V. IYER.—If it is decided to start a factory in the malnad, would it be located at Shimoga or at Bhadravati?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—It is not possible to say anything now.

Mr. P. SUBBARAMA CHETTY.—When is the report expected?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—It is not a very simple question and may therefore take some time.

Land Revenue Remissions.

Q.—41. Messrs. M. Rattehalli RAMAPPA (Sagar Municipality); **VENKATAGIRI RAO Melavarige** and **VENKATAGIRIAPPA** (Sagar Taluk).—Will the Government be pleased to state

(*a*) what is the amount of remissions of land revenue sanctioned for each district, each year, for the last three years;

(*b*) what is the amount of rain gauged in each taluk of the Shimoga District for the last three years;

(*c*) what is the principal crop grown in the Shimoga District; what is the quantity of the crop grown each year for the last three years?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman).—

District	1932-33 Rs.	1933-34 Rs.
Bangalore ...	20,554	25,569
Kolar ...	44,152	52,503
Tumkur ...	44,940	32,166
Mysore ...	28,286	20,476
Hassan ...	8,394	13,114
Shimoga ...	17,700	34,471
Kadur ...	5,553	7,834
Chitaldrug ...	12,249	7,105
Total ...	1,81,828	1,93,238

	1934-35 Rs.	Remissions of 1934-35 sanctioned from 1-7-35 to 15-9-35 Rs.
Bangalore ...	28,357	81,619
Kolar ...	1,16,460	...
Tumkur ...	7,586	67,151
Mysore ...	41,526	5,029
Hassan ...	10,925	199
Shimoga ...	18,480	...
Kadur ...	3,476	...
Chitaldrug ...	8,131	...
Total ...	2,34,941	1,53,998*

* To be revised in the light of information called for from the Districts.

(*b*)—

Taluk	1932-33 In.	C.
Shimoga ...	43	84
Channagiri ...	49	51
Honnali ...	31	59
Shikaripur ...	54	01
Sorab ...	89	67
Sagar ...	105	54
Nagar ...	152	22
Thirthahalli ...	182	72
Kumsi ...	58	52

Taluk	1933-34 In.	C.
Shimoga ...	52	18
Channagiri ...	45	61
Honnali ...	45	69
Shikaripur ...	44	60
Sorab ...	82	45
Sagar ...	104	76
Nagar ...	127	15
Thirthahalli ...	128	75
Kumsi ...	47	24

Taluk	1934-35. In.	C.
Shimoga ...	23	16
Channagiri ...	26	61

A.—41 (*b*)—*concld.*

Taluk		1934-35 In.	C.
Honnali	...	15	94
Shikaripur	....	21	73
Sorab	....	58	93
Sagar	....	68	16
Nagar	....	161	94
Thirthahalli	...	86	27
Kumsi	....	30	99

(*c*) Paddy estimate in *pallas* :—

1932-33	1933-34	1934-35
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
11,33,421	9,83,176	9,80,289

Mr. M. R. RAMAPPA.—Is Shimoga a rice-importing or a rice-exporting district ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Notice.

Mr. M. R. RAMAPPA.—Has it come to the notice of Government that very large quantities of Rangoon rice were imported into that district during 1933-34 and 1934-35 ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—No.

Mr. M. R. RAMAPPA.—At least, do the Government agree that rainfall as well as crop realization is very poor in the Shimoga District ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—May be.

Mr. M. R. RAMAPPA.—If so, why is it that remissions granted in 1934-35 were less than those granted in the previous year ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Crops may fail for various reasons Remissions are not granted in all cases where crops fail ; they are granted only under tanks.

Mr. M. R. RAMAPPA.—What was the total amount of remissions recommended by the Deputy Commissioner ; and how much of it was sanctioned by the Government ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Notice. I may add that remissions were sanctioned according to rules.

Mr. M. R. RAMAPPA.—Why is it that in certain cases remissions recommended by the Deputy Commissioner were not sanctioned by Government ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I do not accept that statement.

Mr. M. R. RAMAPPA.—Is it not a fact that *kandayam* has not been paid by the raiyats in some of the taluks even now due to sheer inability to pay ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—That may not necessarily be due to inability to pay. There are outstandings in all districts.

Mr. V. V. IYER.—Will the Government be pleased to dispose of all pending cases very early ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Certainly.

Mr. VENKATAGIRIAPPA.—Out of the total amount of remissions sanctioned for the Shimoga District, how much is for Sorab and Shikaripur Taluks ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Talukwar details are not available just now.

Mr. VENKATAGIRIAPPA.—Has it come to the notice of Government that the people have not been able to raise even 50 per cent of crops this year ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—No.

Mr. VENKATAGIRIAPPA.—Have not complaints been received that *pahani* accounts in some of the taluks of the Shimoga District have not been maintained correctly ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—No.

Mr. VENKATAGIRIAPPA.—Even though the Deputy Commissioner made certain recommendations in respect of Sorab and Shikaripur Taluks, how is it that the Revenue Commissioner did not sanction them ?

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. Matthan).—It is not always possible to sanction all recommendations made.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—How many recommendations relating to 1934-35 are still pending ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I do not remember the number. But the amount involved is about Rs. 45,000.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Will it not be convenient if all cases are disposed of before the *khist* season closes ?

The REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. N. Madhava Rao).—They relate to only 3 taluks and in those taluks the demand had not been collected.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY.—Till those cases are disposed of, will you kindly put off collections?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAO.—Yes.

Mr. VEERABHADRAPPA. — What are the talukwar details as contained in the report of the Deputy Commissioner regarding rainfall and crop realizations for the year 1934-35?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAO.—The report is that there was an excess of rains in some taluks. Remissions cannot be given under the rules in such cases. They will be granted only if crops fail due to non-supply of water from tanks.

Mr. Belur SRINIVASIENGAR.—Were not the recommendations sent up by the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, in respect of grant of remissions turned down by the Revenue Commissioner?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAO.—No.

Mr. Belur SRINIVASIENGAR.—When the matter was brought to the notice of the Government at the last session of the Legislative Council, did not the First Member of Council promise to enquire into it?

Mr. K. MATTHAN.—No.

Difficulties of Motor Bus Owners.

Q.—45. Mr. Mudbagal KRISHNAPPA (Nagar Taluk).—Will the Government be pleased to state

(*a*) what is the amount of Road Cess collected from the Motor Services in each district and in each year for the last three years from 1932;

(*b*) what is the expenditure incurred on these services annually for the last three years in each district from 1932;

(*c*) are the Government aware that the Bus Proprietors are being put to much loss;

(*d*) are the Government aware that the levy of the provincial tax on the seating capacity of the buses from January 1936 would cause hardship to the owners of buses;

(*e*) are the Government aware that bus owners are put to heavy loss on account of keen competition and large increase in the number of buses licensed to ply?

A.—The GENERAL SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. H. V. Ramasvami).—(*a*) *Vide* statement below:—

ROAD CESS COLLECTED.

Name of District		1934-35 Rs.	1933-34 Rs.	1932-33 Rs.
Chitaldrug	...	24,798	24,349	21,547
Mysore	...	1,05,981	1,00,175	1,13,290
Hassan	...	29,961	28,855	29,607
Tumkur	...	38,067	39,570	41,667
Kolar	...	49,308	47,234	55,987
Kadur	...	37,163	34,084	33,394
Shimoga	...	44,871	41,239	36,790
Bangalore	...	1,23,978	1,22,063	1,51,314

(*b*) Government have no information.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) No.

(*e*) No.

Mr. Mudbagal KRISHNAPPA.—When any service suspends itself for a time in any year, will it get any relief in regard to the amount of cess to be paid for it for that particular year?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—Not as a rule.

Mr. V. V. IYER.—On what basis are licences granted to several bus services?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—There is a committee to look into this matter in each district. Its recommendations are based on the traffic requirements of the district and Government pass orders on such recommendations.

Mr. V. V. IYER.—Will not all the services suffer if too many are permitted?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—No such cases have come to notice. If the number is too large, it may be reduced.

Mr. C. M. GARUDACHAR.—With reference to answer to (*d*) will the Government be pleased to say what the number of buses in Madras was before the provincial tax was levied there and what the number is now after such levy?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—We have no information.

Mr. C. M. GARUDACHAR.—Are Government at least aware that there has been considerable agitation against the principle of taxation on the basis of seating capacity?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—No.

Mr. C. M. GARUDACHAR.—Are they aware that there are certain